DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 035 355 HE 001 269

TITLE	Proposed Alterations In The Governance Of The University.
INSTITUTION	American Association of University Professors, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	3 Oct 68
NOTE	27p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.45
DESCRIPTORS	*Administration, *Faculty Organizations, *Governance, *Higher Education, *Student Participation
IDENTIFIERS	*Stanford University

ABSTRACT

The introduction reads: "We are dissatisfied with the style or manner of administration at Stanford. Hitherto the faculty and students have had insufficient information to discuss University policies effectively. Information that has been provided has come too little and too late. Our goal is for greater participation in setting University policy and not just ratifying it. Hence numerous recommendations ask for a greater quantity of timely information relevant to major decisions and urge increased faculty and student participation in the decision-making process." The resolutions, which are accompanied by discussion and which were accepted by the Stanford chapter of the A.A.U.P., deal with: the Board of Trustees, appointment of administrative officers, discussion of University issues, faculty and student participation in decision making, the student role in governance, crisis handling, financial matters, protection of personal privacy, and the implications for the university of external social pressures. (JS)

ED035355

STANFORD CHAPTER

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

PROPOSED ALTERATIONS IN THE GOVERNANCE OF THE UNIVERSITY

October 3, 1968

Preface

This set of resolutions is substantially the same as that submitted to the Stanford Chapter at the end of the summer of 1968 by its Committee on the Governance of the University. After discussing the Committee's recommendations, the Chapter voted on the resolutions by secret ballot (207 valid ballots were cast) and accepted all of them by a two-to-one majority or better, except for Resolutions 18 and 32 which carried by narrower margins.

The Chapter also voted on 27 resolutions regarding governance of the University which were submitted by members but were not approved by the Committee on Governance. All of these failed except for Resolution 54 contained in this report.* The Committee willingly defers to the Chapter's judgment on this issue.

---

* The resolutions were defeated by margins of two-to-one or better, except for one resolution which was only narrowly rejected. It reads as follows: Academic personnel (teachers and researchers) should be informed no later than May 31 of their salaries for the next academic year.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE 001 269

Introduction

We are dissatisfied with the style or manner of administration at Stanford. Hitherto the faculty and students have had insufficient information to discuss University policies effectively. Information that has been provided has come too little and too late. Our goal is for greater participation in setting University policy and not just ratifying it. Hence numerous recommendations ask for a greater quantity of timely information relevant to major decisions and urge increased faculty and student participation in the decision-making process. We do not recommend that the Trustees and the President relinquish or even share much of their final authority, but decisions should be made only after consultation and with full opportunity for expression of dissenting views.

Board of Trustees

Stanford's Board of Trustees has a long and distinguished record of service to the University. However, it is not wholly immune to the ills that beset all Boards of Trustees, in particular, a tendency to become isolated from some segments of the University community and, as a self-perpetuating body, to be narrow in its representational base. In addition, there is a strong historical tendency at Stanford for the Board of Trustees to insist on retention of the power of ultimate decision in all University business and to make delegation of power, particularly to faculty and student groups, tentative or uncertain. These tendencies have had unfortunate results and should be corrected.

At the present time, faculty and students can normally communicate with the Board of Trustees only through the President's office or the Provost, although there is a great deal of informal and unregulated communication between members of the Board and selected faculty members. In the interest of effective and balanced communication, we recommend that:

(1) There should be direct and formal mechanisms for student, faculty, and staff communication with the Board of Trustees, such as Boards of Visitors appointed by the Board of Trustees or Standing Liaison Committees appointed by the Academic Senate, the ASSU or other appropriate bodies.

Historically, membership on the Board of Trustees has been largely confined to successful and established representatives of the world of business and the professions, resident in California. It has rarely included people with professional experience in the academic aspects of University life. In view of the problems facing the University today, we recommend that:

(2) The membership of the Board of Trustees should be more representative--professionally, politically, geographically, and in age distribution--of the composition of contemporary American society.

(3) While it would not be appropriate for Stanford faculty or students to be members of the Board of Trustees, because this would blur the delineation of roles in University governance, it is important that persons engaged in academic functions in other institutions be made members.

Despite the advisability of excluding Stanford faculty from actual membership on the Board of Trustees, there are areas of Board business in which regular participation by faculty could have healthy effects in allaying criticism of Board actions and improving the efficiency of its operations. In this belief, we recommend that:

(4) Faculty members be appointed to serve on appropriate Committees of the Board of Trustees, and particularly on the Committee on Investments and the Nominating Committee.

The key t improvement of relations between the Board of Trustees and other parts of the University lies in the Board's willingness to recognize the need for the explicit delegation of powers. It is our belief that there is no need to change the legal position of the Board provided that it is responsive to this need. We therefore recommend that:

(5) A committee be appointed of Trustees, administrators, faculty, and students to study the problem of delegation of power by the Board of Trustees and to make recommendations of specific areas in which explicit delegation is desirable.

Appointment of Administrative Officers

One of the major responsibilities of the Board of Trustees is the selection of the President of the University. We believe it appropriate that the President, to whom so much power is delegated by the Trustees, should be appointed by them. Without reducing their power or responsibility, we believe the Trustees should seek a broad basis of opinions and information during the search for a President. The Trustees previously used an alumni advisory group and this year worked closely with a representative group of faculty. When, once again, the Trustees must search for a President, these groups as well as the students should be represented in the advisory process. The Trustees should determine the number of representatives from each group and the manner in which they should serve as an advisory body. The faculty, students, and alumni should appoint their representatives to the advisory group. We recommend that:

(6) In the future selection of a President, the faculty, the Alumni Association, and the students should have representatives on an advisory group to aid the Trustees.

Advisory groups should also participate in the selection of the major administrative officers of the University. Referring the appointment to the Advisory Board after the search has been completed does not adequately take into account faculty viewpoints and knowledge. Faculty should participate at all stages of the search. Students should also participate in the selection process. The relative contributions of faculty and students should vary according to the office to be filled. The faculty and students should appoint their representatives to the advisory group. We recommend that:

(7) There should be formal faculty and student representation, varying according to the office to be filled, in all stages of the selection and reappointment of major administrative officers in the Provost's Office, the President's Office, and the Schools. Such officers include all Vice-Presidents, Vice-Provosts, Associate Provosts, and Deans of Schools, but shall not include officers performing purely staff functions.

Most department heads are viewed, and view themselves, as professional colleagues laden with incidental administrative tasks. A recent study for SES indicates, however, that a few department heads who have served for many years have come to exercise excessive administrative power. Stanford appoints department heads annually. This term is so short as to be meaningless, since reappointment is usually automatic. A one-year period is too short to provide either adequate opportunity for the incumbent or sufficient basis for evaluating his performance. We recommend that:

(8) Department heads should be appointed after consultation with the entire faculty of the department. The term of the appointment should be specified and longer than one year.

Reappointment of a department head may often be appropriate. Any reappointment, however, should receive the approval of the majority of the department faculty. We believe that the University administration must have the right to appoint a new department head against united opposition of the faculty, thereby providing a mechanism for improvement of departments that are below standard. After completion of the usual term, one would usually assume that the reappointment of the department head would meet with the approval of most of his colleagues. In cases where the administration wishes to reappoint a department head against the wishes of the faculty, it should be permitted only with the approval of the Advisory Board. We recommend that:

(9) Reappointment of department heads should require the approval by secret ballot of a majority of the department faculty. Exceptions should be approved by the Advisory Board.

Discussion of University Issues

It is desirable that there be maximum discussion and understanding of issues within the University community in order that many alternatives be considered during the development of policy, and that members of the University be well informed. Stanford's style of communication needs modification in the direction of greater openness. We recommend that:

(10) Whenever possible, information on issues affecting members of the University should be made available to them before final decisions are made.

(11) Forums for discussion by the whole University community on controversial issues (like ROTC, in loco parentis, the University's relation to the "military-industrial complex") should be held. Ground rules for discussion should guarantee a hearing for all relevant views. The AAUP intends to sponsor such forums until other sponsors appear.

(12) A regular means should be established through which faculty, students, administrators, and Trustees could inquire about future policy intentions, aspects of present policy, and progress on prior recommendations. The President should consult with various groups in order to establish mechanisms to this end.

(13) Some Academic Senate meetings should be open to the entire University community, but non-members should not be given the privilege of the floor.

(14) Senators should develop mechanisms for communication with their faculty constituents.

(15) There should be reciprocal exchange of summaries of actions between the Academic Senate and Board of Trustees.

Good discussion of issues requires opportunities to examine and contemplate various positions in some detail. This is done best through written statements. This campus is seriously deficient in publication of information, viewpoints, and debate on controversial issues. We recommend that:

(16) An independently edited supplement to the Daily or a separate publication should be published on a regular basis, to contain articles by members of the University on issues before the community, or on issues that need to be raised. Furthermore, a means should be established for rapid dissemination of important information in time of crisis. Publication of literary, political, and other journals by groups on campus should also be encouraged.

An understanding of the University requires knowledge of the patterns of resource allocation, the associated problem areas, and the directions chosen for future development. We recommend that:

(17) The President or the Provost should present the rationale behind each year's allocation of funds to the Academic Council and entertain questions.

(18) Deans should present to their faculties comparative summary data for fields and schools on salaries, budgets, and other aspects of resource allocation. (The committee was divided on this issue. People voting on both sides agreed there are serious difficulties in carrying out this recommendation.)

Participation in Decision-Making

Faculty and students now particpate more directly and more actively in policy-making groups. They serve on University committees and elected bodies. Whether such service is by election or appointment, the work of such groups is impeded if an individual is not free to use his judgment and must check directly with his constituency. We recommend that:

(19) When participating on policy-making bodies, students and faculty should usually function as representatives, free to use their judgment on specific issues, rather than as instructed delegates.

There are times when a substantial number of faculty members or students desire to see a University policy reviewed or changed. Examples of such issues are ROTC, campus student residence rules, classified research, etc. A mechanism is required to insure that appropriate attention is given in a timely way to these matters. We recommend that:

(20) An initiative procedure should be established by the President so that, if a sizeable proportion of students or faculty or staff request a specific policy change, the relevant decision-making groups must take action on the issue within a specified period.

Resource allocation directly affects and influences all academic activities. Allocation occurs at a number of levels: total budget divided into academic and non-academic portions, academic portion divided among schools, school portion divided among departments. This apportionment is not construed by faculty in a narrow fiscal sense, but as a primary determinant of the scale of their programs, requiring that faculty goals, expertise and values be considered in deciding on the allocation. The administration should retain final authority for resource allocation. We recommend that:

(21) There should be much increased faculty participation in the resource-allocation process.

Long-range University planning has only tangentially included faculty know-how, experience, and aspirations. Priorities established over five to ten year periods become hard and fixed at the early stages of such planning. Mechanisms now exist by which faculty contributions to long-range thinking can be provided early in the process. We recommend that:

(22) The long-range plans of the University should be presented by the Vice-President for Finance to the Academic Senate so that the Senate can participate in the setting of priorities.

Several hundred faculty and staff own homes on campus. They and their families are permanent residents of a community without any local self-government. Management of any issue is in the hands of the Business Office of the University without rights or privileges accruing to the campus resident save for legal and judicial processes. We recommend that:

(23) Permanent campus residents should have as much local self-government as possible.

The Committee of 15 began as a bargaining and negotiating body on issues arising in the University community. To date almost all issues sent to the Committee of 15 have come from the student body. We recommend that:

(24) The faculty and the administration should make more use of the Committee of 15 and other negotiating bodies.

Membership on the Committee of 15 is divided equally among students, faculty, and administration. The purposes of the Committee are not served well by this numerical egalitarianism. We support the recommendation of the Committee of 15 that:

(25) The composition of the Committee of 15 should be changed to 6 students, 6 faculty and 3 administrators.

Business office decisions and operations have not adequately reflected faculty influence. Faculty and student values and sentiment play no role in a number of issues that affect or influence the academic setting. The Business Office deals with a very wide range of issues including land development, police, fire, physical plant, student and faculty housing, etc., but these matters are resolved without advice or consent of faculty or students. This precludes participation in the formal setting of objectives and selection of alternative strategies. We recommend that:

(26) A faculty group should be established by the Academic Senate to review and aid in formal long-range planning in the Business Office, to aid in operational decisions which impinge on the educational process, and to share responsibility of evaluating the performance of the Business Office. This faculty group should actively consult with students and staff.

As currently constituted, the Presidential standing committees advise on and often administer programs which are central to the educational purposes of the University. Faculty membership on these committees must not by design or inadvertence represent a single view or be composed of simply the acquiescent. We recommend that:

(27) Faculty members of Presidential standing committees should be appointed by the President from a slate proposed by the Committee on Committees of the Academic Senate. This does not apply to ad hoc committees and does not affect the President's non-faculty appointments to any of his committees. Opportunities should be given for faculty members to indicate interest in particular committees.

At least two Academic Council Committees have traditionally been chaired by the administrative officer of the activity under the purview of the committee. This practice makes it difficult for the committee to discharge impartially its advisory and review functions. We recommend that:

(28) No administrative officer should be chairman of the Presidential or Academic Council committee which reviews his own operations.

One of the greatest causes of frustration is the ritualistic consultation of a committee after a decision has been formulated. This practice most often occurs when non-academic decisions are made. Certainly an administrative officer is not bound to accept a committee's advice in every decision, but such advice should be sought well in advance of the decision. Moreover, as the University increases in complexity, non-academic decisions, those involving accounting methods, buildings, traffic, campus housing, etc., have increasing impact not only upon the educational activities but also upon the general quality of university life. We resolve that:

(29) Too often, committees are consulted after tentative decisions have been made. It is important that committees participate, not rubber-stamp.

In several parts of the University, decisions have important effects upon the total environment of the University, but there is little opportunity for the University community to affect these decisions. The most important of these areas are the Business Office, the Controller's Office and the Development Office. We recommend that:

(30) To insure adequate and timely expression of opinion, the President should invite the Academic Senate to nominate liaison committees to work with the Business, Controller's, and Development Offices and to keep the faculty, staff, and students apprised of contemplated decisions that could affect them.

Many junior faculty members believe they are denied a proper role in the academic affairs of their departments. There is particular disaffection among instructors, full-time lecturers, and acting assistant professors who are not currently members of the Academic Council. We recommend that:

(31) The various schools should establish committees to review voting practices in their constituent departments in order to insure adequate participation of junior faculty members. The role of the research associate in departmental affairs should also be reviewed.

(32) The Academic Council should be expanded to include other full-time teachers who are not candidates for a Stanford degree and who hold instructor, lecturer, or acting professorial ranks.

Student Role in University Governance

The following resolutions are meant to increase student participation in making policy within the University. A primary form for developing University policy is the committee. Final decisions, however, are often made by individuals or groups in the administration. Students should function both as members of University committees and as advisors to administrative organs and policy-making bodies.

Students already are voting members of Presidential committees, but they have served on Academic Council committees as non-voting consultants. On these committees, they participate in the discussion of policy on a wide range of issues (excluding personnel decisions and the awarding of individual degrees). We see no reason to deny students the vote. We recommend that:

(33) Student members of Academic Council committees should be voting members.

The power of decision often does not rest in committees but in the bodies to which they report. If student views are to be adequately represented at the time the committee reports are acted upon, students should have an opportunity to be heard at this time. Student members of a committee that has been studying an issue are usually the students most qualified to speak on that issue. We therefore recommend that:

(34) When committees, standing or ad hoc, report to the Academic Senate, all members including students should be allowed to attend and to speak.

It is important for the political well-being of the entire community that ASSU government be strengthened, so that there will be a firm base for student participation in University government.

Student leaders are now actively working on this problem, and we do not deem it our proper function to offer advice on how greater representativeness and more sustained student interest in ASSU can be achieved. We wish to express our concern through the following resolution:

(35) There is need to improve ASSU government. The problem of how to achieve this must be left in the hands of the students themselves.

The method of choosing student members for committees should be such that the students selected (1) represent reasonably well the whole spectrum of student opinion, (2) are individuals with interest and competence in the subject-matter with which the committee will deal, and (3) are chosen by the students. The problem of representativeness is a particularly thorny one; student opinion is polarized into an active left group and a somewhat less active right group, with a large group of individuals who only rarely enter the arena of pressure and counter-pressure on the campus but who, we believe, deserve representation. In recent years, there have been instances in which minority blocs of student opinion appear to have been heavily over-represented among the student appointees to a committee. It would not be workable to have all members of all committees directly elected. We recommend that:

(36) Student appointments to University committees should be controlled by ASSU. Student appointments should be made by a student Committee on Committees, which will seek information on the interests and competence of possible appointees. This committee should be selected by a procedure fostering representativeness, such as: (1) election by the student body at large, or (2) election by the body of student representatives. Neither individual committee members nor the members of the Committee on Committees should be appointed by the president of ASSU

alone. Openings for committee appointments should be publicized--perhaps by notices in the Daily--so that interested students will have an opportunity to apply to the Committee on Committees and as wide as possible a range of student talent will be available for the committee to choose from.

In the recent history of appointment of students to committees, it has sometimes happened that student appointees have not attended meetings nor otherwise constructively participated in the committee's work. We recommend that:

(37) The chairman of a committee shall have the right to ask the appointing body for one or more new members to replace previously appointed ones, if he deems it necessary.

In general, the numbers of faculty, students, and administrators to serve on a committee should be determined by the body to which it reports. We recommend that:

(38) The Academic Senate, in consulation with ASSU, should decide the number of student members on Academic Council committees, subject to annual review.

Students have a great deal of information concerning the quality of the classroom teaching at Stanford. They also have valuable insights and suggestions about how that teaching might be improved. We do not want teaching to become a popularity contest, and clearly a number of important considerations other than student opinion should contribute to the evaluation of teaching and decisions about personnel actions and curriculum change. Nevertheless, student opinion should be consulted on more occasions and in a greater variety of ways than is true at present. We recommend that:

(39) Student opinion on teaching should be taken into account by departments and schools at the time decisions on promotions, reappointments, and tenure are made. Students should not vote on promotions or appointments, but there must be a regularized procedure for soliciting student opinion on teaching.

(40) Departments should get regular feedback from undergraduates and graduate students concerning curriculum and requirements.

Crisis Handling

The above resolutions are intended to open the channels for wider student and faculty participation in University governance, and to permit orderly change in response to the needs of various groups when University procedures or institutions have become outmoded. If these resolutions are implemented, we expect some beneficial effect on student unrest to follow, but obviously no new set of procedures will fully meet the current situation.

So far as our committee has been able to discover, the most frequent dissatisfactions expressed by varying numbers of students are these: (1) the existing system of classroom work and examinations fosters an attitude of "gamesmanship" that is perceived to be incompatible with true education; (2) many faculty members are perceived to be uninterested in students; (3) there is inadequate student participation in University government; and (4) important aspects of University education are irrelevant to the students' primary interests and concerns. Undoubtedly, concern with issues not directly under the control of the University--such as the Viet Nam war and the urban crisis--feed into the sense of dissatisfaction with campus life. It is not our purpose here to judge whether these dissatisfactions are legitimate, but only to say that they exist among a substantial number of able students.

Expressions of dissatisfaction may involve issues of civil rights. All members of the University have the same civil rights on campus that they would have elsewhere. These rights include the rights of free speech, peaceable assembly, and freedom from unwarranted

search and seizure. They include the right to hear speakers of their choice, regardless of any speaker's views, and this implies that meetings at which invited speakers appear must not be disrupted by dissenters.

The exercise and protection of civil rights must occur in the context of the University's continuing to carry on its primary educational functions, and the exercise of civil rights by one group must not occur in such a way as to violate the civil rights of other groups. For these reasons, there must be some regulation of the time and place of assembly, the use of loud speakers, etc., and some limitations on the amount of time that students, faculty, and administrators can be expected to spend in responding to grievances and negotiating change. It is imperative that ground rules shall be established quickly, by procedures in which students and faculty participate, and that once established, all constituencies of the University community shall stand behind them. We recommend that:

(41) The rule-making procedures recommended by the Committee of 15 should be put into operation immediately.

In the past, there has been a tendency to regard the maximum penalty--suspension or expulsion from the University--as the only recourse for discipline. We believe that penalties for infractions should be more flexibly adjusted to individual circumstances. For example, fines or service with a social agency might be imposed for certain infractions, in place of suspension. We recommend that:

(42) A graded system of penalties for students should be established.

Demonstrations occur when there are both a touch-off incident and a set of deeper grievances. The touch-off incident by itself

cannot rally enough student support to generate a large protest. Thinking in these terms, we do not share the widely held "small minority" theory: that student protest is the work of a destructive, misguided small minority, and that the way to end student unrest is to separate the small minority from the well-behaved majority. The small minority cannot arouse a large number of students to action unless these students already feel aggrieved. The central problem for University government is then not the small minority who talk revolution but the larger group of disaffected students.

A distinction should be made between demonstrations which injure persons, involve significant property damage, or disrupt important University functions and those which do not. The latter should not be viewed as catastrophes requiring maximum response. Clearly the intensity of the response should vary with the nature and seriousness of the student actions.

With respect to the use of police, perhaps a lesson may be learned from the experience at other universities. After one campus disturbance, an SDS member said that the lesson the SDS had learned was to provoke the University as soon as possible into calling the police, since this was the best way to radicalize the campus. At the same time, a University administrator said that the lesson that the administration had learned was to call the police onto the campus at the earliest possible moment in order to nip student protest in the bud. The two 'lessons' chart a collision course. We recommend that:

(43) The University should seek a political, not a 'military' solution to student protest. The police should be called only when it is unavoidable, and then solely to prevent personal injury, significant property damage, or disruption of important University functions, and not to suppress the protest itself. Wherever possible, the issue of the protest should be resolved through negotiation.

We cannot specify in advance what actions are to be taken. These are decisions which are determined by the events of the moment, and which require careful judgment at every stage.

During periods of crisis, it is essential that communication among students, faculty, and administration be kept open, and that dialogue among these groups take place. This will help to insure that administrative actions will be based on the fullest possible understanding of both student and faculty views, and that, once taken, such actions will have faculty support. Experience suggests that decisions must usually be made in too short a time to allow full faculty consultation. Nevertheless, decisions should lie with a group which hopefully would be collectively wiser in time of crisis than one person. The probability of wide support can be enhanced by the formation of a small representative faculty group well in advance of any crisis, whose members are participants in whatever decisions or responses are made. We recommend that:

(44) The Academic Senate should appoint a standing committee which should be involved in the planning of responses, and in decisions concerning the application of responses to be made in a crisis situation, including selection of negotiation teams. It should be the responsibility of members of this committee to maintain a network of contacts with other faculty members and with students, and to work out an effective method for tapping student and faculty opinion during times of crisis.

Financial

An army travels on its stomach, a University on its checkbook. To gauge the thrust of University activity as between construction and academic activity, as between teaching and research, as among schools and departments, it is necessary to measure the fractions of available resources put into various alternative uses. Even to be informed as to what is going on in the University, it is essential to know how its money is being spent. This information is not currently published in sufficient detail. Tedium is preferable to ignorance. To influence the course of future action, it is necessary to know what expenditures are planned in sufficient time to react critically and to offer alternative plans.

To measure the resources available, it is essential that there be full and detailed information on all sources of funds, current and anticipated. Adequate financial reports must also reflect flows of funds into and out of all reserve accounts. We recommend that:

(45) There should be more detailed reporting to the University public of all financial manifestations of current University activity and of plans and commitments for future expenditures.

The present method of University financial planning for the various programs, schools, and departments involves the implicit assumption that the dollar budget ("budget base") of the administrative unit may not be reduced. Thus resource allocation becomes a matter of deciding how increments in expenditure are to be shared; obviously this hampers those activities that are in need of rapid expansion. We recommend that:

(46) There should be periodic re-examination of the budget base of all programs and administrative units, and reductions should be made where necessary.

The year by year increase in the University's planned expenditures will never be precisely equal to the growth in University income. Moreover unanticipated increases in prices or the appearance of unforeseen opportunities for expansion of activities may suggest temporary spurts of actual expenditures above what had been planned. In such cases the Trustees should give careful consideration to the possibility of running a temporary deficit.

We recognize the necessity of maintaining equality between income and expenditure over any appreciable period of time, but suggest that this equality need not serve as a shackle upon the University's annual budget. This suggestion gains support from the fact that the projection of annual revenue to which annual expenditure planning is tied is admittedly subject to sizeable errors of forecast.

We recommend that:

(47) The Trustees should, when necessary, incur temporary deficits.

Protection of Individuals

University administrators regularly receive information, solicited and otherwise, derogatory to individual members of the community, faculty, staff, and students. Much of this material is beneath consideration and is discarded. However, some items considered of doubtful validity are nonetheless retained in personnel files as "information" but without informing the individual of the item so that he might enter a defense if he sees fit. We consider this administrative practice to be wrong. We recommend that:

(48) The University administration has a moral and perhaps a legal obligation to inform any member of the University community of any negative, non-academic information from any source, however obtained, if that information is retained in University personnel files.

Last spring this AAUP chapter appointed an Ombudsman Board to hear complaints from any member of the community against the behavior of any person or group in the University. Where appropriate, the Board will assist the aggrieved individual in seeking redress.

We recommend that:

(49) The University should formally adopt the Ombudsman Board as a University institution, with the President, Academic Senate, ASSU, and organizations of staff employees appointing Board members, instead of the AAUP.

External Implications

The primary activity of a University is to create and disseminate knowledge. As a locus for disinterested study, a University appropriately minimizes its commitments to particular political, social, legal, or economic arrangements. Ideological commitments by a University discourage investigations that might tend to oppose such commitments. But to minimize commitments is not to avoid them. Stanford University's policies have major social consequences, and we urge that Stanford's positions be formulated with full awareness of these consequences.

One way in which the University has a major impact on society is by training persons who will play important leadership roles in that society. As the society's needs and resources shift, it is important that Stanford evaluate alternate kinds of training for new types of leaders. For example, should Stanford be concerned about training in the areas of urban affairs, international relations, and community organization? The department based on existing disciplinary boundaries is not the appropriate group to consider such programs. We recommend that:

(50) The Committee on Undergraduate Education and the Committee on the Graduate Division should jointly consider establishment of new training programs.

Stanford University, as a major business organization, hires a large number of people, lets large contracts, makes major investments, and is a major land owner and developer. It has a significant impact on the entire Midpeninsula. There is no way that Stanford can avoid decisions among competing values. No decision is itself a decision.

Until very recently Stanford's record in this area has been poor. It has often failed to take into account the results of its economic decisions upon its employees, its neighbors, and nearby minority groups. In its own hiring practices with respect to minority groups, the University has recently taken an admirable step forward; we can only bemoan the fact that it was not as a leader but as a late entry into this field. The City of Palo Alto has recently set forth certain conditions on hiring of minority group members by local contractors. Stanford must make a decision either to use similar standards in letting contracts or not to reinforce Palo Alto's pressure. We recommend that:

(51) The advisory committee established to work with the Business Office should take as part of its task the consideration of ways in which Stanford's business decisions can contribute to the well-being of the entire community and serve as a model for other organizations.

We note that significant criticisms or suggestions are often made by persons outside the University and are not given due consideration. For example, the land development decisions of the University have a significant impact upon the entire Midpeninsula. Its residential developments have been almost completely designed for high income groups, perpetuating de facto segregation. Recently the University has been accused of negligence in failing to develop model communities of mixed racial and economic backgrounds. We do not mean to suggest that Stanford's financial interests should be neglected but wish rather to propose that other values should be taken into account before making a decision. We recommend that:

(52) The advisory committee to the Business Office or the Ombudsman Board should route complaints or objections to the appropriate decision-making bodies and see that they are given appropriate consideration.

The issue of Stanford's relation to governmental agencies is a very serious problem in the minds of many members of the University. The committee has not been able to arrive at any conclusion on the matter, given the bewildering complexity of the problem and the paucity of information readily accessible to us. We believe that this problem needs very careful, informed, and dispassionate discussion, and that actions should be based on the fullest possible information. We recommend that:

(53) The University Committee on Research Policy should take as part of its charge the publication of a major report on Stanford's relation to government agencies. Individuals should be encouraged to present their views in hearings before the Committee. A University-wide forum should be held to discuss it.

Additional Resolution

(54) The name of the position now called "executive head of the department" should be changed to "chairman of the department."

Respectfully submitted,

J. Merrill Carlsmith
Elizabeth G. Cohen
Gordon A. Craig
Sanford M. Dornbusch (ex officio)
Heinz Eulau
Henry B. Eyring
Edwin M. Good (Vice-Chairman)
Hubert Heffner
Halsted R. Holman
Oliver W. Holmes
Victor Hori
Stephen J. Kline
Eleanor E. Maccoby
Melvin W. Reder (Chairman)
Herbert Solomon
Wilfred Stone